

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/826,015	ERICSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nitin Patel	2673	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Nitin Patel. (3) Kathy Voisinet.
 (2) Chang Nyguen. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 04 December 2003.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: Claims 1,18.

Identification of prior art discussed: Yes.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant argues Sklarew does not teach a method for generating and association with regard to information by means of a hand held device arranged to sense the absolute position coding pattern characterized by sensing when the handheld device passes over a discontinuity in the absolute position coding pattern. Examiner agrees to withdraw the final rejection. However, the examiner asserts the claims are so broad that they could be read on a barcode system when a barcode machine could read a barcode that senses. We also discussed the discontinuity, prior art, and finally examiner has suggest to put claim 2 is allowable if include in element of claim 1.